

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,497	09/24/2001	Katsumi Yamato	214130US2RD	5795	
	22850 7590 06/29/2004			EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			ENG, GEORGE		
ALEXANDRIA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2643		
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/960,497	YAMATO, KATSUMI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George Eng	2643			
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ration. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. 3ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>24 September 2001</u> .				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application Papers	vithdrawn from consideration.				
· · · <u> </u>					
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of	numents have been received. numents have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4. 	948) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Art Unit: 2643

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements filed 9/24/2001 (paper no. 2) and 6/30/2003 (paper no. 4) have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, the term "any" renders the claims vague and indefinite because the term "any" has an alternative meaning, which does not positively identify the claimed limitation.

Art Unit: 2643

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 are also rejected because of depending on claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively, containing the same deficiency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami et al. (US 2003/0156569 A1 hereinafter Kawakami) in view of Thornberg et al. (WO 97/16039 hereinafter Thornberg).

Regarding claim 1, Kawakami discloses a mobile station (41, figure 1) for use in a radio communication system in which packet communications are carried out by setting up one or more connections between the radio communication device and a radio base station (3, figure 1), the radio communication device comprising a packet receiving unit configure to receive packets from the radio base station through the connections (page 5, [0052]). Kawakami differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a timeout control unit for carrying out a timeout control in which any packet that cannot be received completely through one connection within a timeout interval that is set in advance with respect to the one connection is regarded as lost, a change in a number of active connections that are currently carrying out communications with the radio base station is detected, and a new timeout interval is calculated and set with respect to

Art Unit: 2643

each connection when the change in the number of active connections is detected. However, Thronberg teaches a system for controlling packet transmission delay on one or more packet switched channels of a cellular system comprising a timer for setting a maximum average packet transmission delay, i.e., a timeout interval, in advance with respect to the one connection as regarded to lost (page 8 line 19 through page 10 line 22), a controller for expelling a packet call, i.e., carrying out a timeout control, in which any packet that cannot be received completely through one connection within the timeout interval (page 13 line 18 through page 14 line 18), and a PRCH traffic supervisor function for calculating a new timeout interval and set with respect to each connection when a change in the number of active connection is detected (page 20 line 20 through page 24 line 2) in order to avoid and reduce delays for packet switched channel users in applications that cannot tolerate a long packet delay time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kawakami in having the timeout control unit for carrying out a timeout control in which any packet that cannot be received completely through one connection within a timeout interval that is set in advance with respect to the one connection is regarded as lost, a change in a number of active connections that are currently carrying out communications with the radio base station is detected, and a new timeout interval is calculated and set with respect to each connection when the change in the number of active connections is detected, as per teaching of Thronberg, because it avoids and reduces delays for packet switched channel users in applications that cannot tolerate a long packet delay time.

Regarding claims 2-3, Thronberg teaches the system for controlling packet transmission delay on one or more packet switched channels of a cellular system counting the number of

Art Unit: 2643

active connections as a number of connections that are actually set up between the radio base station and radio terminals and for which packet transmission being carried out within a prescribed period of time (page 3 line 22 through page 4 line 14 and page 15 line 1 through page 16 line 15).

Regarding claim 4, Thronberg teaches the average transmission delay for each packet call increase as the number of packet calls on the packet switched channel increases (page 2 lines 28-30) so that one of ordinary skill in the to calculate and set the new timeout interval which is shorter than a previous timeout interval when the number of active connection is decreased or sets the new timeout interval which is longer than the previous timeout interval when the number of active connection is decreases.

Regarding claim 5, Thronberg teaches to leave the timeout interval unchanged for a connection for which a data transmission rate is guaranteed at a time of setting up that connection (page 24 lines 12-27).

Regarding claim 6, Thronberg teaches to calculate and set the new timeout interval with respect to a packet report that indicates each connection when a data transmission rate provided with respect to one of the connection is changed (page 20 line 25 through page 21 line 29).

Regarding claims 7 and 13, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claims 8-9 and 14-15, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 2-3.

Regarding claims 10 and 16, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claims 11 and 17, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claims 12 and 18, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 6.

Regarding claim 19, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 1.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ohange (US PAT. 6,411,622) discloses a method for detecting timeout of ATM reception packet (abstract).
- 8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2643

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to George Eng whose telephone number is 703-308-9555. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Curtis A. Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4870. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-6306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

George Eng

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2643

Page 7